

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2003 8:30 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner Aderstein
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: D. I. Chance

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2003 7:51 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Paul W. Sapienza

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

Not only do I support this opposition, I want to break up all the monopolies in the broadcast forum including but not limited to radio stations, concert promotion, newsprint and magazines. Also we need to let the Internet forum be unowned and used for free by the public.

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2003 5:11 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Brian Barry

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2003 4:58 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Jeff Solberg

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

It's about time for our Government officials to start acting in support of the people of this nation instead of special interest groups.

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2003 1:43 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

Federal Communications Commission
Communications Secretary

From: Thom Speidel

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

Michael Powell, please DO YOUR JOB and safeguard the public interest on these issues in stead of catering to the interests of the media conglomerates.

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: democraticmedia@democraticmedia.org
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2003 5:07 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KJMWEB; Federal Communications Commission
Subject: Stop the digital broadcast give-away

From: gregew@sover.net

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I am helping the state and national PEG Access efforts to guarantee bandwidth on cable systems as a part of the cable operators' obligation to the public interest in those communities they serve. I believe that digital bandwidth, like analog bandwidth, allocated to public use is a fair and reasonable trade for any telecommunications entity that uses the public rights-of-way, just as broadcasters monopolize and use a bandwidth of the electromagnetic spectrum.

Stephanie Kost

DEC 19 2003

From: David Jayne [davidjayne@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2003 4:58 PM
To: Michael Copps
Cc: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Media consolidation

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Copps,

Thank you for your brave attempts to resist the pro-big-business strategies of your boss and fellow commissioners regarding media consolidation. If Mr. Powell's chairmanship of the FCC isn't the best example of what's wrong with nepotism and cronyism in government, I don't know what is. Quaint, isn't it, that his father's AOL stock value increased by about \$4 million after the FCC approved the AOL-Time Warner merger.

Please continue your efforts to keep media content as diverse as possible, protect local ownership and reduce the number of different media and markets run by single entities. I support your desire for public hearings on this topic, even if Mr. Powell thinks that's unnecessary.

Too bad this current administration and so many of its appointees have such disregard for the American public. Oh well, in about a year, most of them will be looking for new jobs. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David Jayne
908 Potrero Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94110

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Teresa Whitehurst [teresa_whitehurst@hms.harvard.edu]
Sent: Thursday, November 27, 2003 4:12 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

November 27, 2003

Dear Michael J. Copps,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this:
Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems. Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Teresa Whitehurst
2828 Hillside Drive
Nashville, TN 37212
teresa_whitehurst@hms.harvard.edu

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

From: John Rook [jhrook@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:48 PM
To: Larry Shannon; Pepper, Vincent; Gerry Cagle; Eric Rhoads; Arthur P. Beland
Subject: Fw: Radio Foreign Ownership

OCT 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Deputy Secretary

Thought you additional folks might want a piece of this discussion...JR

----- Original Message -----

From: John Gorman
To: John Rook ; Pat Clawson ; John Gorman
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 1:40 PM
Subject: Re: Radio Foreign Ownership

John and Pat,

Radio and television are still under regulations preventing foreign ownership. When the OmniAmerica radio group was formed, it did receive investment dollars from the Fuji Bank but those dollars were borrowed through a third party - and that party was responsible for the debt service. OmniAmerica was responsible to the third party, not the Fuji bank. Clear Channel, being a media company, would not be allowed, under current law, to sell media stock to foreigners. I'm pretty certain I'm right about that.

It's funny. The US wants to deregulate traditional media - but, at the same time, wants to put regulations on the Internet. Big difference here. There is a limited spectrum available for AM, FM, TV, etc. The Internet is infinitesimal. Big difference - and a major problem for the current administration.

How about the RIAA's forthcoming plan to demand that Internet radio stations from outside the US must be blocked because of copyright concerns. If you hear music from a European station, for example, it violates US copyright laws. The RIAA wants it enforced just like they are attempting with downloading music.

JG

At 01:17 PM 10/30/2003 -0800, John Rook wrote:

Pat & John,

this in response to our "foreign owership" commentary....from a reader..
jr

They don't have to unload anything...the money comes legally from overseas and becomes a small part of the stock ownership....if you look carefully at our country this has been

going on for many years...remember when the Japanese owned Rockefeller Center, Pebble Beach etc etc...there is so much money trying to work it's way in to the USA that it is hard to find where it begins and ends...Wall Street is probably the best place to start. In Broadcasting, the foreign investors cannot control a broadcasting company..ie: Azteca..a Mexican video network...they just lease out the properties from the Americans as they cannot own them. This is not a new story...no CC does not have to unload, all they would do is sell a small piece of stock...and continue on...and bear in mind this year is an election year..it will be a big business year for all media

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Sandra Rose [s.p.rose@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 10, 2003 4:18 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KIMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: telecommunications act/ ownership topic

DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commisioners:

Though I am late coming to this issue due to lack of information about it, I hope you will consider my remarks.

Chairman Powell asks that focus be placed on three questions in order to thoroughly justify your decision. Consequently I will try to address those questions as they pertain to me.

I use the media for informative and/or thought provoking entertainment. I use it to acquire sound information about the world on a political, sociological, and cultural level. I distinguish my local media from national and international media. I am very interested in my local media because I believe that politics, like charity, begins at home. I want my local newspaper, radio, and TV to be truly local.

I remember a day when I used to travel to different parts of our country and was amazed as a kid how different everything was; food, retail, entertainment, architecture. These differences existed because we didn't have the franchises and "chains" that exist now. All that is gone for the most part. Once you've seen one mall you've seen them all. I live in a small Virginia town where every ethnic food is to be had. It is hard even here to find what I call a "real" restaurant - one that is not a "chain". Every movie theater looks like every other movie theater. Every subdivision looks like every other subdivision. Our cultural, artisitc dialects are dwindling too rapidly.

Just as deregulation has not worked for the betterment of airline service, telephone service, and just as consolidation has not worked for medicine and countless other "public interests", consolidation of media ownership is not going to be a good idea for the public interest. I have no doubt that it will be a good business move.

For years now I have watched the public networks - my only source of TV- become more and more like Hollywood productions. One is driven nearly mad by the almost identical repetition of the news, all of it being reduced to sound bites with virtually no analysis but lots of glamorous photos and amazing studio sets. (I particularly dislike the fact that photos are televised with no dates or locations. How is one to know that these clips are not dragged out of an old file of years ago or that the dessert is not generic?) I find NPR and Public Television to be by far the very best source of everything. Even though they have been driven to more individual and private support, their " commercials" are not aggressive like they are on network TV. The reporting is in depth and they follow up on stories that deserve to have a conclusion made public. One clearly gets the sense that their news is being gathered by people who have not gone to the highest bidder or who have won a beauty contest. These people really gather and report the news as opposed to "reading "it like the networks do. They also entertain letters from listeners weekly.

For decades we have fought against trusts and monopolies as obstructive to competition and public interest. How on earth can consolidation of media ownership accomplish the goals of education and information in a way that is more objective than what we have now - that not being anything great? It seems very simple to me. If there are only 3 or 4 hands feeding the media - all of which look pretty much alike- then the media is going to be beholden to those hands. Once that relationship develops, collusion at high levels is easy and an informed populace is history.

Thank you for considering these remarks,
Sandra and Lawrence Rose

Stephanie Kost

DEC 10 2003

From: Sandra Rose [s.p.rose@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 10, 2003 4:18 PM
To: Michael Powell; Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KUMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: telecommunications act/ ownership topic

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commisioners:

Though I am late coming to this issue due to lack of information about it, I hope you will consider my remarks.

Chairman Powell asks that focus be placed on three questions in order to thoroughly justify your decision. Consequently I will try to address those questions as they pertain to me.

I use the media for informative and/or thought provoking entertainment. I use it to acquire sound information about the world on a political, sociological, and cultural level. I distinguish my local media from national and international media. I am very interested in my local media because I believe that politics, like charity, begins at home. I want my local newspaper, radio, and TV to be truly local.

I remember a day when I used to travel to different parts of our country and was amazed as a kid how different everything was; food, retail, entertainment, architecture. These differences existed because we didn't have the franchises and "chains" that exist now. All that is gone for the most part. Once you've seen one mall you've seen them all. I live in a small Virginia town where every ethnic food is to be had. It is hard even here to find what I call a "real" restaurant - one that is not a "chain". Every movie theater looks like every other movie theater. Every subdivision looks like every other subdivision. Our cultural, artisitc dialects are dwindling too rapidly.

Just as deregulation has not worked for the betterment of airline service, telephone service, and just as consolidation has not worked for medicine and countless other "public interests", consolidation of media ownership is not going to be a good idea for the public interest. I have no doubt that it will be a good business move.

For years now I have watched the public networks - my only source of TV- become more and more like Hollywood productions. One is driven nearly mad by the almost identical repetition of the news, all of it being reduced to sound bites with virtually no analysis but lots of glamorous photos and amazing studio sets. (I particularly dislike the fact that photos are televised with no dates or locations. How is one to know that these clips are not dragged out of an old file of years ago or that the dessert is not generic?) I find NPR and Public Television to be by far the very best source of everything. Even though they have been driven to more individual and private support, their " commercials" are not aggressive like they are on network TV. The reporting is in depth and they follow up on stories that deserve to have a conclusion made public. One clearly gets the sense that their news is being gathered by people who have not gone to the highest bidder or who have won a beauty contest. These people really gather and report the news as opposed to "reading" it like the networks do. They also entertain letters from listeners weekly.

For decades we have fought against trusts and monopolies as obstructive to competition and public interest. How on earth can consolidation of media ownership accomplish the goals of education and information in a way that is more objective than what we have now - that not being anything great? It seems very simple to me. If there are only 3 or 4 hands feeding the media - all of which look pretty much alike- then the media is going to be beholden to those hands. Once that relationship develops, collusion at high levels is easy and an informed populace is history.

Thank you for considering these remarks,
Sandra and Lawrence Rose

RECEIVED

Stephanie Kost

DEC 1 9 2003

From: Guitarstar@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 10:20 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: media concentration

Federal Communications Commission

Office of the Secretary
RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Mr. Adelstein,

Federal Communications Commission

I urge you to stop the concentration of media into fewer corporations. This is a threat to our democracy and makes for bland entertainment.

Rusty Sweeton
2145 Hwy 109 N
Lebanon, TN 37090

Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Cog Dammet' [existentialistiam@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2003 6:42 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Oppose Media Mergers

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 10, 2003

Dear Michael K. Powell,

I know you are busy. But prior to your vote on June 2, stop for a moment to consider this:

Imagine if America's news media emphasized solutions, rather than problems. Imagine if America's top journalists were paid to inform, rather than titillate, dramatize, and report anything as "news" to boost ratings.

If you support this vision, you will vote against allowing giant media corporations to grow even bigger. For example, I think it's dangerous for one company to own both the leading daily newspaper (often the only daily newspaper) and a local TV station in the same city. This ownership arrangement puts too much power in the hands of one media corporation-and it reduces the already small number of independent media voices we hear in our communities.

Please join with all your colleagues and act now to stop big media from getting even bigger.

Sincerely,

Cog Dammet'
box 1117
Healdsburg, CA 95448
existentialistiam@earthlink.net

Stephanie Kost

From: Robert McChesney [rmcchesney@mediareform.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2003 12:51 PM
To: info@mediareform.net
Subject: Moment of truth for media and democracy

RECEIVED

DEC 7 2003

Media corporations are getting bigger and democracy is losing. Journalism has become dumbed-down entertainment, we are deluged by advertising, and elections have become scripted horseraces instead of forums for meaningful debate.

And it's getting worse. This summer the Federal Communications Commission made it easier for media giants to get even bigger. In response to massive public outcry -- some three million Americans wrote or called Washington in an unprecedented show of opposition -- the Senate passed a full rollback of the FCC rules. Now members of the House of Representatives are listening to big media lobbyists instead of the public, and are blocking a vote.

Today we've reached a make-or-break moment that hinges on you. With three simple steps, you can make the difference. Your petition and phone call are the only ways to force a vote on legislation that would reverse the FCC's decision.

STEP ONE

Sign the online petition to roll back the FCC rules. Go to <http://www.mediareform.net/petition.php>.

STEP TWO

Call your U.S. Representative. Go to <http://www.mediareform.net/callcongress> for the number and details. Most Members of Congress get fewer than 5 calls a day from constituents on ANY legislative issue. 10 calls on one issue looks like a banner day. 50 makes people sit up and wonder. 100 lights a fire.

Why call? Because a letter is being circulated by leading House Democrats and Republicans calling for a vote on media ownership. If your Representative hasn't signed it, please call them and ask him/her to do so. Over 120 (out of 435) have signed already. Click here <http://www.mediareform.net/callcongress> to find out if your Representative is on the letter. Instructions are provided.

STEP THREE

Forward this message to everyone you know.

Yours,

Robert W. McChesney
Free Press

P.S. For more information on the FCC rules and media reform efforts, visit <http://www.mediareform.net>. Working together we can build a better media.

BACKGROUND

Since the FCC loosened media ownership rules on June 2, the House and Senate have voted for three bills that overturn some or all of the changes. Not a single one of these bills has passed in both chambers.

On September 16th the Senate voted by an overwhelming margin for a full reversal of the FCC's blunder. It's now in the House of Representatives, but the Speaker of the House -- Rep. Dennis Hastert -- is rejecting the democratic process. Hastert, who controls the House voting schedule, says he has no plans to allow a vote on the resolution. Republican Majority Leader Tom Delay has called the Senate bill "dead on arrival." They won't permit a vote because they don't want it to pass. They favor the concentration of corporate wealth over a democratized media system (see <http://www.mediareform.net/news.php?id=1178> for details). Your action is the only thing that will change their minds.

Visit <http://www.mediareform.net/remove.php> to be removed from future mailings.

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Alan Bassingthwaighte [graham61@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2003 4:35 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: fcc REGULATIONS. Please tighten regulations; We need more diversity!

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Micheal Powell,

Almost every American wants more diversity of ownership, and our democracies health maybe dependent on it. Why not follow the good healthy instinct of the American people and actually tighten regulations so that one corporation would have to sell off portions of their company in a single market. To do the opposite only serves the greed of hte few at the expense of the many. Mainstream news has already reached new levels of placidity and cowardess.

Do the right thing and represent the people's airways.

Alan Bassingthwaighte

Do you Yahoo!?

The New Yahoo! Shopping - with improved product search <http://shopping.yahoo.com>

Stephanie Kost

From: Tina Winkler [tspinel1@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2003 6:23 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: FCC Consolidation

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Mr. Powell,

I am deeply troubled and disturbed at the FCC's allowance of what amounts to a building by media conglomerates. The media, as you know, is the Fourth Estate and needs to maintain objectivity. By allowing people such as Rupert Murdoch to increasingly own more television and radio stations in the same market we lose the media's ability to report the news and not be hindered by special interests. I am deeply disturbed by the movement to consolidate media power. Please keep this mind as the FCC consider this very important policy decision.

Regards,

Tina Winkler

Stephanie Kost

From: William's email [whirai80@adelphia.net]
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2003 11:05 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

DEC 1 9 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William Irvine
480 Center Road
Bedford, Ohio 44146-2224

Stephanie Kost

From: Tina Winkler [tspin1@twcny.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2003 6:23 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: FCC Consolidation

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

I am deeply troubled and disturbed at the FCC's allowance of what amounts to monopoly building by media conglomerates. The media, as you know, is the Fourth Estate and needs to maintain objectivity. By allowing people such as Rupert Murdoch to increasingly own more television and radio stations in the same market we lose the media's ability to report the news and not be hindered by special interests. I am deeply disturbed by the movement to consolidate media power. Please keep this mind as the FCC consider this very important policy decision.

Regards,

Tina Winkler

Stephanie Kost

From: William's email [whirai80@adelphia.net]
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2003 11:05 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William Irvine
480 Center Road
Bedford, Ohio 44146-2224

Stephanie Kost

From: fusco453@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2003 1:26 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Telecommunications Act

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

My name is Christian Fusco, and I am not a part of a special interest group. I am a citizen concerned with the perposed degregation of media rules regarding conglomeration and the ever shrinking ownership base that produces most of the media present in our country. I am even more disturbed however by the lack of attention this issue is recieving through the mediums which it wishes to deregulate. If it is your opinoin that most people don't care about these regulations, it is because they are unaware of the perposed changes. I ask that you give the American people the opportunity to become informed on this issue. If you believe in the deregulations as a postive step forward for America, then lets present the issue to the people. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Christian Fusco

Stephanie Kost

From: David Fugere [david@thebestguys.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2003 1:40 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: a vote for the Corporate America

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

We have no hope you will represent us as you are a puppet of the moneyed interests. Do you have no shame as you sell the people of America down the drain?

David Fuger

Stephanie Kost

From: Old Man [jacourtney@interfold.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 11:48 AM
To: Michael Powell
Cc: Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Media Monopolies
Chairman Powell et. al.,

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I understand that monopolies are the Republican Party way, but they are not the democratic republic way, which is what our great country is supposed to be. We already have too few choices when it comes to getting news and information that reflect a variety of viewpoints. The federal government does enough censorship when it comes to the news we hear and the information (or dis-information) we can access. Please do not put more layers of censorship in our path to the truth by letting the huge media monopolies that already exist expand even more. Listen to the people and their congressional representatives, and stop these runaway expansions. **We do not want them to continue!**

Deregulation of the media will only create higher walls between the federal government and the people to whom they are supposed to be accountable. I understand that accountability is something the government tries to avoid, but you do not need to help them by letting these irresponsible expansions continue.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Jonathan A. Courtney

A seeker of Truth, Justice, and the United States of American way.

Power to the people!

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Old Man [jacourtney@interfold.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 11:48 AM
To: Michael Powell

Cc: Kathleen Abernathy; Michael Copps; KM KJMWEB; Commissioner Adelstein

Subject: Media Monopolies

Chairman Powell et. al.,

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I understand that monopolies are the Republican Party way, but they are not the democratic republic way, which is what our great country is supposed to be. We already have too few choices when it comes to getting news and information that reflect a variety of viewpoints. The federal government does enough censorship when it comes to the news we hear and the information (or dis-information) we can access. Please do not put more layers of censorship in our path to the truth by letting the huge media monopolies that already exist expand even more. Listen to the people and their congressional representatives, and stop these runaway expansions. **We do not want them to continue!**

Deregulation of the media will only create higher walls between the federal government and the people to whom they are supposed to be accountable. I understand that accountability is something the government tries to avoid, but you do not need to help them by letting these irresponsible expansions continue.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Jonathan A. Courtney

A seeker of Truth, Justice, and the United States of American way.

Power to the people!

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Sorrells David MSgt 375 CS/SCV [David.Sorrells@scott.af.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 8:40 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Protect innocent young children!

RECEIVED

Aug 28 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

David Sorrells, MSgt
Scott AFB, IL
USAF

Seek ye FIRST the kingdom of God and his righteousness... Matthew 6:33

Stephanie Kost

From: Coleman, Anna E. [ColemanA@health.missouri.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 9:20 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: FCC's plan to raise the media caps

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,



btzhsepa.gif (1 KB)

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence. Commercials are rampant with the same indecent material, even on shows that are halfway acceptable, in my opinion.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards. As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities. I am very thankful for my local stations and **DO NOT WANT TO SEE THEM LOSE THEIR INFLUENCE!!!**

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

Anna E. Coleman

"Nothing can stop the man with the right mental attitude from achieving his goal; nothing on earth can help the man with the wrong mental attitude." - Thomas Jefferson



Network Blitz
Bkgrd.gif (5 KB)...

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary